



Docket No: 241330US6YA

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No: 10/650,729

Applicants: Chung-Peng HO et al.

Filing Date: August 29, 2003

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR DRYING A  
SUBSTRATE

Group Art Unit: 1756

Examiner: CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
Steven P. Weihrouch  
Registration No. 32,829

Edwin D. Garlepp  
Registration No. 45,330

Customer Number

**22850**

(703) 413-3000 (phone)  
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\ATTY\EDG\2312 - TOKYO ELECTRON\PC\PC 9002A\241330US\REST RESP CVR 2.05.DOC



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

STEVEN P. WEIHROUCH  
(703) 413-3000  
SWEIHROUCH@OBLO.COM

EDWIN D. GARLEPP  
SENIOR ASSOCIATE  
(703) 413-3000  
EGARLEPP@OBLO.COM



DOCKET NO: 241330US6 YA

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

CHUNG-PENG HO ET AL. : EXAMINER: CHACKO DAVIS, D.

SERIAL NO: 10/650,729

FILED: AUGUST 29, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1756

FOR: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR DRYING A SUBSTRATE

## **RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 28, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group I, Claims 1-32, drawn to a method. Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement for the following reason.

MPEP § 803 states:

MPEP § 803

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.


However, the outstanding Restriction Requirement has not established that an undue burden would exist if the Restriction Requirement was not issued and all the claims were examined together. Moreover, the claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully also traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Application Serial Number: 10/650,729  
In Response to the Office Action of January 28, 2005

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-34 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch  
Registration No. 32,829

Edwin D. Garlepp  
Registration No. 45,330

SPW:EDG:tdm  
I:\ATTY\EDG\2312 - TOKYO ELECTRON\PC\PC 9002A\241330US\RESP TO RSTR 2.05.DOC